



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/063,432 | 04/23/2002 | Habib Vafi | gems186/yod | 4968 |
| 28046 | 7590 | 04/15/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| FLETCHER, YODER & VAN SOMEREN P. O. BOX 692289 HOUSTON, TX 77269-2289 | | | TRINH, MINH N | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3729 | |

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/063,432

Applicant(s)

VAFI ET AL.

Examiner

Minh Trinh

Art Unit

3729

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-86 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I (claims 1-18) in the reply filed on 1/24/05 is acknowledged. However, with respect to claims 19-86, these claims are directed to number inventions that is independent or distinct from the elected invention claim 1-18 as indicated in the prior Office Action paragraph 1-2, and clearly each inventions I-VI has a separate status in the art and a separate field of search because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Therefore, Applicant's reasons therefore are not persuasive. Applicants are not entitled to examination of multiple independent inventions in one application. Moreover, examination of the independent inventions herein would present a serious burden to the Examiner in as much as the searches are not coextensive and the art is quite prolific Accordingly, the requirement is repeated and **MADE FINAL**.

2. Claims 19-86 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions II-VI, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 1/24/05. Applicant therefore is requested to cancel all non elected claims or take other appropriate action.

3. The abstract should have been revised to reflect the claimed method invention.

Drawings

4. Applicant is required to furnish a formal drawing under 37 CFR 1.81(c). No new matter may be introduced in the required drawing. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5, 9-12 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koshio (6,392,143) in view of Chappo et al (6,510,195). Koshio discloses a method for assembling tile detectors or the like comprising: bending a flexible panel to a curved shape (see Fig. 6A-C), inversely bending the flexible panel to a desired shape to close gaps between at least one detector tiles 12a (see Figs. 6A-C). Koshio does not teach a step of coupling a plurality of detector tiles to the flexible panel in the curved shape. Chappo et al teach the coupling a plurality of detector tiles 1001 to the flexible panel 1003 in the curved shape (see Fig. 2C). Further, It is also inherent to inverse bending of the flexible panel in order to obtain a desired shape as so to provide a close gaps between the detector tiles

Furthermore, regarding the step of inversely bending the flexible panel to a desired shape to close gaps between the detector tiles. It would have been an obvious

matter of design choice to choose any desired shape and gaps configurations between the detector tiles since applicant has not disclosed that these features are critical, patentably distinguishing features and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the shape and gaps configurations as taught by the applied prior art references (i.e., see related Fig. 6A-C of Koshio).

As applied to claims 2-3, regarding applying fluid and/or gas pressure to at least one side of the flexible panel are known to the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize the teaching as described above onto the modified invention Koshio/ Chappo et al in order to bend the at least one side of the flexible panel.

As applied to claim 4-5, Koshio discloses the curved solid and the support frame structure (see Fig. 6C).

As applied to claim 9, note Chappo et al disclose the detector tiles in the configuration such as edge to edge (note that reference 1001 of Chappo et al having it associated elements in the form of edge to edge configurations and gap between edges therefrom).

As applied to claims 10-12, regarding the bending the flexible includes the act of releasing a bending force applied to the flexible panel and relaxing the flexible panel to a flat shaped and that as recited in claim 12. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to choose any desired bending including the configurations as described above since applicant has not disclosed that these features are critical, patentably distinguishing features and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with

the shape and gaps configurations as taught by the applied prior art references (i.e., see related Figs. 6A-C of Koshio).

Limitations of claims 16-17 are also met by the above discussion (see also Figs. 6A-C of Koshio, depicts the limitations of these claims where at least one detector tiles 12a being attached to a PCB or the like).

As applied to claim 18, It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to choose any desired soldering material bending including the configurations as described above since applicant has not disclosed that these features are critical, patentably distinguishing features and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the shape and gaps configurations as taught by the applied prior art references (i.e., see related Figs. 6A-C of Koshio).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 6-8 and 13-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Prior Art References


8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art references are cited for their teaching of method of assembling radiation detectors or the like.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Trinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4569. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (571) 272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mt

Minh Trinh 4/7/05
Primary Examiner